

ON THE DECIDABILITY OF THE ZERO-DIVISOR PROBLEM

ŁUKASZ GRABOWSKI

ABSTRACT. Let $G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_n \rangle$ be a finitely generated group. Consider the alphabet $A(G)$ consisting of the symbols $g_1, \dots, g_n$ and the symbols “+” and “−”. The words in this alphabet represent elements of the integral group ring $\mathbb{Z}[G]$. We investigate the computational problem of deciding whether a word in the alphabet $A(G)$ determines a zero-divisor in $\mathbb{Z}[G]$. Under suitable assumptions, we observe that the decidability of the word problem for G implies the decidability of the zero-divisor problem. However, we show that in the group $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2 \wr \mathbb{Z})^4$ the zero-divisor problem is undecidable, in spite of the word problem being decidable.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_n \rangle$ be a finitely generated group. Let $A(G)$ be the alphabet consisting of the symbols $g_1, \dots, g_n$ and the symbols “+” and “−”. A word w in this alphabet determines an element, also denoted by w , of the integral group ring $\mathbb{Z}[G]$. In this paper we are interested in the decidability of the following computational problems:

Zero-divisor problem for G . Input: A word w in the alphabet $A(G)$. Problem: Is w a zero-divisor in $\mathbb{Z}[G]$?

l^2 -zero-divisor problem for G . Input: A word w in the alphabet $A(G)$. Problem: Is there $v \in l^2G$ such that $wv = 0$?

In Section 3 we prove the following proposition (Proposition 3.2.)

1.1. Proposition. *Let G be a sofic group whose orders of finite subgroups are bounded, which fulfills the Atiyah conjecture. Then the decidability of the word problem implies the decidability of the l^2 -zero-divisor problem.*

We briefly explain the soficity assumption and the Atiyah conjecture in Section 3. There is currently no group whose orders of finite subgroups are bounded, and which is known to be either not sofic, or to not fulfill the Atiyah conjecture.

1.2. Corollary. *Let G be an amenable group whose orders of finite subgroups are bounded and which fulfills the Atiyah conjecture. Then the decidability of the word problem implies the decidability of the zero-divisor problem.*

Proof. Amenable implies sofic ([Pes08]); by [Ele06] (see [Pap08] for a concise proof), being an l^2 -zero-divisor is equivalent to being a zero-divisor in the group ring of an amenable group. $\square$

To provide more concrete examples, recall that the class of elementary amenable groups is the smallest class of groups containing all abelian and all finite groups and closed under taking extensions (e.g. solvable groups are elementary amenable.)

1.3. Corollary. *Let G be a finitely presented elementary amenable group whose orders of finite subgroups are bounded, and which is residually finite. Then the zero-divisor problem for G is decidable.*

Proof. Such a group fulfills the Atiyah conjecture [Lin93], and its word problem is decidable ([LS01], pp.195.) $\square$

Recall the definition of the lamplighter group $\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z} := \mathbf{Z}_2^{\oplus \mathbf{Z}} \rtimes \mathbf{Z}$, where the action of the generator $t \in \mathbf{Z}$ on a function $f: \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_2$ is by the shift $(t.f)(s) := f(s-1)$. Sections 4-6 are devoted to showing the following (Theorem 6.2.)

1.4. Theorem. *The zero-divisor problem in $(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^4$ is undecidable.*

1.5. Corollary. *Let G be a group given by the presentation*

$$\langle a, t, s \mid a^2 = 1, [t, s] = 1, [t^{-1}at, a] = 1, s^{-1}as = at^{-1}at \rangle.$$

Then G^4 is meta-abelian, all torsion elements are of order 2, its word problem is decidable, but the zero-divisor problem for G^4 is undecidable.

Proof. The first three properties follow from [GLSŻ00]. For the last property, note that if A is a group, B is a subgroup and $T \in \mathbb{Z}[A]$; then T is a zero-divisor in $\mathbb{Z}[A]$ iff it is a zero-divisor in $\mathbb{Z}[B]$ - this follows from the fact that the left action of T on $\mathbb{Z}[A]$ preserves the right cosets of $\mathbb{Z}[B]$, and similarly for the right action. Therefore the last property also follows from [GLSŻ00], since it is proven there that $\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z}$ embeds into G . $\square$

1. *Remarks.* (1) Given a finitely generated group $G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_n \rangle$, let the *torsion problem* for G denote the computational problem of deciding whether a word in the symbols $g_1, \dots, g_n$ corresponds to an element of finite order in G . Note that the undecidability of the torsion problem implies the undecidability of the zero-divisor problem, because for $g \in G$, we have that g is of finite order iff $1 - g \in \mathbb{Z}[G]$ is a zero-divisor. However, in groups where torsion elements have bounded orders, the decidability of the word problem implies the decidability of the torsion problem, and so for both $(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^4$ and G from the corollary the torsion problem is decidable.

(2) We could formulate the matrix-zero-divisor and matrix- l^2 -zero-divisor problems as above, but with the input consisting of a matrix $M \in M_k(\mathbb{Z}G)$. We restrain from this because of the appeal of the concise definition of the alphabet $A(G)$. However Proposition 1.1 and Corollaries 1.2 and 1.3 remain true in this generalized setting with exactly the same proofs.

(3) Recently various counterexamples have been constructed to the Atiyah conjecture, starting with [GŻ01] (compare [DS02]), through the ground-breaking [Aus09], and to the more recent [Gra10b], [PSZ10], [Gra10a] and [LW10]. In particular it is shown in [Gra10a] that the group $\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z}$ is a counterexample. For a given group G one could consider the following very weak "Atiyah-like" property of having "computably small atoms": we say that a finitely generated group G has computably small atoms iff there exists a computable function $l: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with the property that for every word w in the alphabet $A(G)$ we have that $\dim_{\mathbb{N}} \ker w \neq 0$ iff $\dim_{\mathbb{N}} \ker w > \frac{1}{l(|w|)}$, where $|w|$ is the length of w .

On the one hand, Theorem 1.4 shows that $(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^4$ does not have computably small atoms. On the other hand, it follows from the proofs that in the formulations

of Proposition 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 we could replace the Atiyah conjecture with the property of having computably small atoms.

Versions of the Atiyah conjecture are known to hold in many cases, see for example [Lin93], [LOS10], [LS07], and the survey in the chapter 10 of [Lüc02].

(4) It would be interesting to consider other computational problems for the language $A(G)$. Note that the $T \in \mathbb{Z}[G]$ is not an l^2 -zero-divisor iff it is an invertible in the ring of affiliated operators ([Lüc02], Lemma 8.8, Chapter 8). One could similarly consider the computational problems of being invertible in the group ring $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ or in the von Neumann algebra LG . This last problem corresponds to the question of whether the property of having a spectral gap around 0 is decidable. It would be in particular interesting to give sufficient conditions for the spectral gap decidability, similar to Proposition 1.1.

(5) The exponent in Theorem 1.4 could be lowered from 4 to 3 at the price of making the argument slightly more involved: in Proposition 4.1 we would have to argue for the foolproofness of a Turing machine without adding the additional tape. Furthermore, for the matrix-zero-divisor problem (see remark (2) above) we could lower the exponent to 2, since one of the factors comes precisely from embedding matrix rings into the group ring of $\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z}$ (Lemma 6.1.) This is all the author knows about lowering the exponent. In particular it would be interesting to consider the zero-divisor problem for the group $\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z}$ itself.

The author wishes to thank Światosław Gal, Jarek Kędra, Nikolay Nikolov and Andreas Thom for valuable remarks on earlier versions of this paper.

2. NOTATION AND CONVENTIONS

The infinite cyclic group is $\mathbf{Z}$, the cyclic group of order n is $\mathbf{Z}_n$, the rings of integers, rationals, reals, and complex numbers are respectively $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{Q}$, $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$.

Rings and operators. Given a ring R , the ring of $k \times k$ -matrices over R is denoted by $M_k(R)$. A **trace** τ on R is a function $\tau: R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\tau(ab) = \tau(ba)$. If R is a $*$ -ring of operators on a Hilbert space then we also require that $\tau(T^*T)$ is a non-negative real number, for all $T \in R$. The standard trace (i.e. sum of diagonal elements) on $M_k(\mathbb{C})$ is denoted by tr , and $\frac{\text{tr}}{k}$ is denoted by tr_{vN} , and referred to as von Neumann trace.

Given a group G the complex group ring and the Hilbert space of l^2 -summable functions are denoted by $\mathbb{C}G$ and l^2G . The basis elements of the latter space are denoted by $\zeta_g, g \in G$. We have an action of $\mathbb{C}G$ on l^2G by bounded linear operators: it's induced by the action of G on l^2G defined by $g \cdot \zeta_h = \zeta_{gh}$. The von Neumann trace on G is defined by $\text{tr}_{vN}(A) := \langle A\zeta_e, \zeta_e \rangle$, where $e \in G$ is the neutral element.

If R is a $*$ -ring of operators on a Hilbert space, then a trace τ on R is called **normal** if it extends to a continuous trace on the weak completion of R . A trace is **faithful** if, for every T , $\tau(T^*T) = 0$ implies $T = 0$. All the traces defined above are faithful and normal.

If R is a $*$ -ring of operators on a Hilbert space, τ is a faithful normal trace on R , and $T^* = T \in R$ then the **spectral measure of T** is the usual projection-valued spectral measure of T composed with τ (it makes sense to evaluate τ on

spectral projections of T , since the latter are in the weak completion of R). It will be denoted by μ_T . The spectral measure of the set $\{0\}$ is called **von Neumann dimension of kernel of T** , denoted by $\dim_{vN} \ker(T)$. For a non-self-adjoint T we define $\dim_{vN} \ker(T) = \dim_{vN} \ker(T^*T)$. For more information on the spectral measures see [RS80].

Graphs. Given a graph K , the sets of vertices and edges of K are denoted by $V(K)$ and $E(K)$. If edges are labeled, then for $e \in E(K)$ the label of e is denoted by $l(e)$. The Hilbert space spanned by $V(K)$ is denoted by $l^2 K$; if K is finite then the standard and normalized traces on endomorphisms of $l^2 K$ are - as in the case of $M_k(R)$ above, denoted by tr and tr_{vN} . The elements of the standard basis of $l^2 K$ are denoted by ζ_v , $v \in V(K)$.

The ball of radius R at $v \in V(K)$ is denoted by $B_K(v, R)$.

If K is oriented and labeled by complex numbers then the associated convolution operator is the unique operator $T: l^2 g \rightarrow l^2 g$ such that $\langle T(\zeta_x), \zeta_y \rangle$ is equal to 0 if there are no edges between x and y and to sum of all the labels between x and y otherwise.

If G is a group, and $(g_i) = (g_1, \dots, g_n)$ is a symmetric sequence of elements of G (i.e for every $g \in G$ the number of times g appears is the same as the number of times g^{-1} appears) which generates G , the Cayley diagram of G with respect to (g_i) , denoted $\mathcal{C}(G, g_i)$ is the oriented labeled graph whose vertices are elements of G and with an oriented edge with label g_i from a to b iff $ag_i = b$.

When we refer to elements of a sequence (g_i) , we mean that for example g_1 is a different element than g_2 , even if their value is actually the same.

3. DECIDABLE l^2 -ZERO-DIVISOR PROBLEM

Let G be an at most countable discrete group.

The Atiyah conjecture. For a more detailed discussion of the Atiyah conjecture see [Eck00] or [Lüc02]. There are various versions of the Atiyah conjecture (compare Remark (3) in the introduction.) For the purpose of this paper, we say that G fulfills the Atiyah conjecture (over $\mathbb{Q}$) iff there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $T \in M_n(\mathbb{Q}[G])$ any atom of the spectral measure of T has measure expressible as a rational number with k as the denominator. We denote by $k(G)$ the minimal such k .

In the usual formulation of the Atiyah conjecture one demands that $k(G)$ is equal to the least common divisor of the orders of finite subgroups of G . Of course this classical Atiyah conjecture implies the version used here, and hence the results stated in the introduction are valid under the classical definition of the Atiyah conjecture as well.

Sofic approximations. For a more detailed discussion of the sofic groups see [Gro99], where they were introduced, or the survey [Pes08]. Let $G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_n \rangle$ be a finitely generated group. Suppose that $(g_1, \dots, g_n)$ is a symmetric generating sequence. Let K be a finite oriented graph labeled by the elements of the sequence (g_i) in such a way that 1) at every vertex the out- and in-degrees are at most n and each of the symbols g_i appears at most once as the out- and at most once as the in-label; 2) the number of edges labeled by a given g_i from v to w is equal to

the number of such edges from w to v (and by the previous assumption it is either zero or one.)

For $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $R > 0$, we say that K is an (ε, R) -sofic approximation of G with respect to the sequence (g_i) if the set

$$\{v \in V(K) : B_K(v, R) \text{ is isomorphic to } B_{\mathcal{C}(G, g_i)}(e, R)\}$$

has at least $(1 - \varepsilon) \cdot |V(K)|$ elements. The group G is sofic iff for every ε and R there exists an (ε, R) -sofic approximation of G with respect to (g_i) (this definition does not depend on the choice of the symmetric generating sequence.) A not finitely-generated group is defined to be sofic iff all its finitely generated subgroups are sofic.

Given an element $T \in \mathbb{C}G$ represented by the sum $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i g_i \in \mathbb{C}G$ we define the graph $K(T)$ by taking K and replacing each label g_i by a_i . The notation is abusive, because $K(T)$ might depend on the representation of T as a sum rather than on T , but this will not lead to any problems. Define $\pi_K(T) : l^2(K) \rightarrow l^2(K)$ as the convolution operator on $K(T)$.

Recall that if for every vertex $v \in K(T)$ the sum $\sum |l(e_i)|$ over all out-edges starting at v is at most 1 then $\pi_K(T)$ has operator norm at most 1, as an operator on $l^2(K)$ (this follows for example from the Minkowski integral inequality, [HLP52], paragraph 6.13.) It follows that if $\sum_i |a_i| \leq 1$ (in particular the norm of the operator $|T|$ is at most 1) then the norm of $\pi_K(T)$ is at most 1.

Note also that if T is self-adjoint then so is $\pi_K(T)$.

It follows from the spectral theorem that if $T \in M_n(\mathbb{Q}[G])$ is a positive self-adjoint operator of norm at most 1, then

$$\mu_T(\{0\}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{tr}_{v_N}(1 - T)^n.$$

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, for general operators on a Hilbert space there is no way to decide how big an n to take, in order for $\text{tr}_{v_N}(1 - T)^n$ to be ε -close to the limit. However, the situation is better in the case of elements of the group ring of a sofic group. The author learned about the following proposition from Andreas Thom. Since it does not seem to be in the literature (but compare [Tho08], [ES05], and the proof of Lemma 3.179 in [Lüc02]), we give a proof based on the proof of the Lück's approximation theorem (the latter originally proven in [Lüc94].)

3.1. Proposition. *Let G be a sofic group and let $T \in \mathbb{Q}[G]$ be a positive and self-adjoint element whose sum of coefficients is smaller than 1. Suppose that the smallest common multiple of the denominators of the coefficients of T is equal to C . Then*

$$|\text{tr}(1 - T)^n - \mu_T(\{0\})| < \frac{3 \cdot C}{\log(n)}.$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon(n) = \frac{C}{\log(n)}$. Note that $\varepsilon(n^k) = \frac{\varepsilon(n)}{k}$. Let $T = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i g_i$; without any loss of generality we can suppose that G is generated by the symmetric sequence $(g_1, \dots, g_n)$. Let K_n be an $(\varepsilon(n), n)$ -sofic approximation of G for the sequence (g_i) , and let $\pi_n(T) = \pi_{K_n}(T)$ be the associated convolution operator on $l^2(K)$. Let μ_n be the spectral measure of $\pi_n(T)$ and let μ be the spectral measure of T (both with respect to the relevant von Neumann traces.)

In this proof all integrals are over the interval $[0, 1]$, unless explicitly stated otherwise.

Claim: For all m, n we have $\mu_m((0, \frac{1}{n})) < \varepsilon(n)$.

Proof: There exists a polynomial whose coefficients are rational numbers with denominators at most $C^{|K_m|}$, and whose roots are precisely the non-zero eigenvalues of $\pi_m(T)$. Therefore

$$|\prod \alpha| \geq \frac{1}{C^{|K_m|}},$$

where the product is over non-zero eigenvalues of $\pi_m(T)$. By estimating the roots smaller than $\frac{1}{n}$ by $\frac{1}{n}$, and the rest by 1, we get

$$\frac{1}{C^{|K_m|}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\mu_m((0, \frac{1}{n})) \cdot |K_m|},$$

and so

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\mu_m((0, \frac{1}{n}))},$$

from which the claim follows by taking logarithms.

Claim: For all n we have $\mu((0, \frac{1}{n})) < \varepsilon(n)$.

Proof: We first show that for any continuous function f we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int f(x) d\mu_m(x) = \int f(x) d\mu(x),$$

i.e. that the measures μ_m converge weakly to μ . By Weierstrass approximation it is enough to show it for a monomial x^n . In this case we have

$$\left| \int x^n d\mu(x) - \int x^n d\mu_m(x) \right| = |\mathrm{tr}_{vN} T^n - \mathrm{tr}_{vN} \pi_m(T)^n|,$$

And the right hand side is equal to

$$\left| \langle T^n \zeta_e, \zeta_e \rangle - \frac{\sum_{v \in V(K_m)} \langle \pi_m(T)^n \zeta_v, \zeta_v \rangle}{|V(K_m)|} \right|.$$

Suppose $m > n$. Then apart from $\varepsilon(m) \cdot |V(K_m)|$ vertices, we have $\langle T^n \zeta_e, \zeta_e \rangle = \langle \pi_m(T)^n \zeta_v, \zeta_v \rangle$, since both quantities depend only on the ball of radius n around the relevant vertex. Noting this and estimating both $\langle T^n \zeta_e, \zeta_e \rangle$ and $\langle \pi_m(T)^n \zeta_v, \zeta_v \rangle$ by 1 we get that the above is smaller or equal to $2 \cdot \varepsilon(m)$.

The claim follows from the weak convergence - let δ be such that $\mu([\delta, \frac{1}{n} - \delta])$ is almost equal to $\mu((0, \frac{1}{n}))$, and take f to be a continuous approximation of the characteristic function of $(0, \frac{1}{n})$ such that $f(0) = f(\frac{1}{n}) = 0$, $f(x) = 1$ for $x \in [\delta, \frac{1}{n} - \delta]$, and f is linear on $(0, \delta)$ and $(\frac{1}{n} - \delta, \frac{1}{n})$.

We finally prove the proposition, i.e. $|\mathrm{tr}_{vN}(1 - A)^n - \dim_{vN} \ker \pi(A)| < 3 \cdot \varepsilon(n)$. The left hand side is equal to

$$\int_{(0,1]} (1-x)^n d\mu(x) = \int_{(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})} (1-x)^n d\mu(x) + \int_{[\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, 1]} (1-x)^n d\mu(x)$$

We estimate the first integrand by 1, and the second by $(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})^n$ to get that the above is equal to at most

$$\mu((0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})) + (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})^n,$$

which by the previous claim and a simple calculation is not bigger than

$$\varepsilon(\sqrt{n}) + \left(\frac{2}{e}\right)^{\sqrt{n}} < 3 \cdot \varepsilon(n).$$

□

The main point of this section is the following observation.

3.2. Proposition. *Let $G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_n \rangle$ be a finitely generated group. Suppose that G is sofic, fulfills the Atiyah conjecture, and the word problem for G is decidable. Then l^2 -zero-divisor problem for G is decidable.*

Proof. Let $T \in \mathbb{Z}[G]$. Note that T is an l^2 -zero divisor if and only if the spectral measure of T has an atom at $\{0\}$. Since at the expense of passing to $\mathbb{Q}[G]$ we can replace T by $\frac{1}{|T|} \cdot T^* T$, where $|T|$ is the sum of the absolute values of the coefficients of T , we can as well suppose that T is positive self-adjoint, and the sum of the absolute values of the coefficients of T is at most 1. Let C be the least common multiple of the denominators of the coefficients of T . If the measure of an atom is positive then, by the Atiyah conjecture, it is at least $\frac{1}{k(G)}$. Let n be such that

$$\frac{3 \cdot C}{\log(n)} < \frac{1}{3 \cdot k(G)}.$$

Clearly such n is computable. The algorithm should compute $\text{tr}_{v_N}(1 - T)^n$ (this is possible because the word problem is decidable). Let the outcome of this computation be called γ . By the previous proposition, $|\gamma - \dim_{v_N} \ker T| < \frac{1}{3 \cdot k(G)}$. Since we know that $\dim_{v_N} \ker T \neq 0$ is equivalent to $\dim_{v_N} \ker T \geq \frac{1}{k(G)}$, we get that T is a 0-divisor iff $\gamma > \frac{1}{3 \cdot k(G)}$. □

4. PRELIMINARIES ON TURING MACHINES

For information on Turing machines see [Sip97]. Given a Turing machine M we denote by $A(M)$ and $S(M)$ the alphabet and the set of states of M . The rules by which the Turing machine operates are referred to as the “transition table”. We assume that there are three special states INITIAL, REJECT and ACCEPT in $S(M)$ and that the transition table is specified in such way that the state INITIAL cannot be entered from any other state, and it is left in the first step of operation.

For the standard Turing machines (i.e. where there is only one tape and where the tape head can both write and read the symbols on the tape), we assume that the tape can contain a special symbol EMPTY which is not an element of $A(M)$, corresponding to an empty place on the tape. The transition table has to specify the behaviour of the machine upon reading the EMPTY symbol.

We will also consider read-only Turing machines. For these, instead of the symbol EMPTY, we demand the existence of the symbol DELIMITER which also is not an element of $A(M)$. We assume that the transition table is such that whenever a tape head moves left and afterwards reads the symbol DELIMITER, its next move cannot be to the left; similarly for “right” in place of “left”.

We consider read-only Turing machines with multiple tape heads and with multiple tapes. For the former, the instructions in the transition table cannot be conditioned on whether two tape-heads are in the same position.

By a **configuration** of a Turing machine M we mean a triple consisting of a tape (or multiple tapes) with symbols written on it, a position of the tape head (or tape heads), and a state of M . **Initial configuration** is a configuration whose state is the INITIAL state, and (1) in the case of read-write Turing machines the tape consists of infinitely many EMPTY symbols, followed by a word in the alphabet $A(M)$, followed by infinitely many EMPTY symbols; (2) in the case of a read-only Turing machine each tape is finite and has the form DELIMITER, followed by the word in $A(M)$, followed by DELIMITER. In both cases the tape head (resp. heads) is assumed to be on the first symbol belonging to $A(M)$ on the tape (resp. each tape.)

We say that a Turing machine M is **foolproof** iff it halts (i.e. enters the ACCEPT or the REJECT state) no matter what configuration it is put into before it starts operating. Note that this is stronger than saying that M always halts, as we require that M halts also on configurations which are not initial (and which in principle might not appear in any computation which starts from an initial configuration.)

We prove a variant of a folklore proposition about read-only Turing machines ([Sip97], Exercise 5.26).

4.1. Proposition. *There is an algorithm which given a Turing machine M produces a read-only Turing machine $\mathcal{R}(M)$ with two tape heads such that there is a word which M accepts iff there is a word $\mathcal{R}(M)$ accepts.*

Proof. Let M be a Turing machine. We describe the machine $\mathcal{R}(M)$ in an algorithmic way. Define $A(\mathcal{R}(M))$ to consist of the symbol NEXT CONFIGURATION, the elements of $S(M)$ and the elements of $A'(M) := (A(M) \cup \text{EMPTY}) \times \{0, 1\}$.

The machine $\mathcal{R}(M)$ should first check whether the input starts with NEXT CONFIGURATION followed by a symbol from $S(M)$, followed by a word in $A'(M)$ followed by NEXT CONFIGURATION followed by... and finishing with NEXT CONFIGURATION. The machine should also check if each word in $A'(M)$ has precisely one symbol which maps to 1 (which should be interpreted as the position of the tape head of M). For all this we need just one tape head.

In the second stage the machine $\mathcal{R}(M)$ checks whether the consecutive configurations correspond indeed to the consecutive configurations of the execution of M . This can be done with two tape heads.

In the final stage $\mathcal{R}(M)$ should check whether the ACCEPT symbol appears in the input. $\square$

4.2. Corollary. *There is an algorithm which given a Turing machine M produces a foolproof read-only Turing machine $\mathcal{F}(M)$ with three tapes, such that there is a word which M accepts iff there is a word which $\mathcal{F}(M)$ rejects.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{R}'(M)$ be the machine $\mathcal{R}(M)$ from the proposition with exchanged accepting and rejecting states. Then produce a machine $\mathcal{R}''(M)$ on two tapes which simulates $\mathcal{R}'(M)$ by first checking whether both tapes have the same words written on them.

To assure foolproofness add the third tape. Call its tape head H_3 . For each pair of states $\sigma, \tau \in S(\mathcal{R}''(M))$ add a new state $D(\sigma, \tau)$. If the transition table of $\mathcal{R}''(M)$ for a state $\sigma \in S(\mathcal{R}''(M))$ and symbols $s_1, s_2, s_3 \in A(\mathcal{R}''(M))$ on the

consecutive tapes requires changing the state to τ , then in the transition table for $\mathcal{F}(M)$ require changing the state to $D(\sigma, \tau)$.

In each of the states $D(\sigma, \tau)$, the machine $\mathcal{F}(M)$ moves H_3 to the right, and moves to the accepting state if H_3 reaches the end of the input, and to τ otherwise. $\square$

5. EMBEDDING A TURING MACHINE IN A GROUP RING

A more detailed example of associating an element of a group ring to a Turing machines is in [Gra10b], Section 5. We quote some definitions from there.

Let (X, μ) be a probability measure space and $\rho : \Gamma \curvearrowright X$ be a right probability measure preserving action of a countable discrete group Γ on X . A **dynamical hardware** is the following data: (X, μ) , the action ρ , and a division $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^n X_i$ of X into disjoint measurable subsets. We denote such a dynamical hardware by (X) .

Suppose now that we are given a dynamical hardware (X) and we choose three additional distinguished disjoint subsets of X , each of which is a union of certain X_i 's: the initial set I , the rejecting set R , and the accepting set A (all or some of them might be empty). Furthermore, suppose that for every set X_i , we choose one element γ_i of the group Γ in such a way that the elements corresponding to the sets X_i which are subsets of $R \cup A$ are equal to the neutral element of Γ . A **dynamical software** for a given dynamical hardware (X) is the following data: the distinguished sets I, A and R and the choice of elements γ_i , subject to the conditions above.

Define a map $T_X : X \rightarrow X$ by

$$T_X(x) := \rho(\gamma_i)(x) \quad \text{for } x \in X_i.$$

The whole dynamical software will be denoted by (T_X) . A **Turing dynamical system** is a dynamical hardware (X) together with a dynamical software (T_X) for (X) . We will denote such a Turing dynamical system by (X, T_X) .

If $x \in X$ is such that for some k we have $T_X^k(x) = T_X^{k+1}(x)$ then put $T_X^\infty(x) := T_X^k(x)$. Otherwise leave T_X^∞ undefined.

The **first fundamental set**, or simply the **fundamental set** of (X, T_X) is the subset $\mathcal{F}_1(T_X)$ of I consisting of all those points x such that $T^\infty(x) \in A$ and for no point $y \in X$ one has $T_X(y) = x$. It is measurable ([Gra10b]), and therefore we define $\Omega_1(T_X)$, the **first fundamental value** of (X, T_X) , as the measure of the first fundamental set.

We say that (X, T_X) **stops on any configuration**, if for almost all x we have $T_X^\infty(x) \in A \cup R$; it **has disjoint accepting chains**, if for almost all $x \in \mathcal{F}_1$ we have that for all $y \in \mathcal{F}_1$ the inequality $T^\infty(x) \neq T^\infty(y)$ holds; finally it **does not restart**, if $\mu(T_X(X) \cap I) = 0$.

Suppose now that (X, μ) is a compact abelian group with the normalized Haar measure and the action of Γ is by continuous group automorphisms. Denote the Pontryagin dual of X by $\widehat{X}$ and consider the rational group ring $\mathbb{Q}[\widehat{X}]$ as a subring of $L^\infty(X)$ through the Pontryagin duality. Suppose that the characteristic functions χ_i of the sets X_i are elements of $\mathbb{Q}[\widehat{X}]$.

Put $G := \widehat{X} \rtimes_{\widehat{\rho}} \Gamma$ and define $T, S \in \mathbb{Q}[G]$ by $T := \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \chi_i$ and

$$S := (T + \chi_X - \chi_I - \chi_A - \chi_R)^*(T + \chi_X - \chi_I - \chi_A - \chi_R) + \chi_A.$$

We use the following theorem from [Gra10b] (Theorem 4.3.)

5.1. Theorem. *If (X, T_X) stops on any configuration, has disjoint accepting chains, and doesn't restart, then $\dim_{vN} \ker S$ is equal to $\mu(I) - \Omega_1(T_X)$.*

The main result of this section is the following proposition.

5.2. Proposition. *There is an algorithm which given a foolproof read-only Turing machine M on three tapes produces a finite group $H(M)$ and an element $T(M)$ of $\mathbb{Z}[(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^3 \times H(M)]$ in such a way that there exists a word which M rejects iff $\dim_{vN} \ker T(M) \neq 0$.*

Proof. We algorithmically associate to M a Turing dynamical system which fulfills the conditions of Theorem 5.1, in such a way that $\Omega_1(T_X)$ is smaller than $\mu(I)$ iff there is a word which M rejects.

Let n be the smallest natural number such that $|S(M)| < 2^n$. Consider the group $\mathcal{S} := \mathbf{Z}_2^n$. Choose any $|S(M)|$ non-zero elements of it and label them with the elements of $S(M)$. For any pair of states $\sigma, \tau \in S(M)$ choose an automorphism $\gamma(\sigma, \tau) \in GL(\mathcal{S})$ which sends σ to τ .

Let m be the smallest natural number such that $|A(M)| + 1 \leq 2^m$ and let $\mathcal{A} := \mathbf{Z}_2^m$. Choose any $|A(M)|$ non-zero elements of it and label them with the elements of $A(M)$. Label all the other elements of $\mathcal{A}$ with the DELIMITER symbol.

We define a dynamical hardware. For the compact abelian group we take $X = (\prod_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathcal{A})^3 \times \mathcal{S}$. For Γ take $\mathbf{Z}^3 \times GL(\mathcal{S})$. Each coordinate of $\mathbf{Z}^3$ acts by the Bernoulli shift on the appropriate coordinate of $(\prod_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathcal{A})^3$, and $GL(\mathcal{S})$ acts in the natural way on $\mathcal{S}$.

We use the following notation for the subsets of $X = (\prod_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathcal{A})^3 \times \mathcal{S}$, motivated by thinking about the latter as the configurations of a Turing machine with the alphabet $\mathcal{A}$ and the set of states $\mathcal{S}$. The set $\{(x_i, y_i, z_i), s] \in X : x_0 = a, y_0 = b, z_0 = c, s = \sigma\}$ is denoted by

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \underline{a} \\ \underline{b} \\ \underline{c} \end{array} \right] [\sigma],$$

the set $\{(x_i, y_i, z_i), s] \in X : x_0 = a, x_{-1} = a', y_0 = b, y_{-1} = b', z_0 = c, z_{-1} = c', s = \sigma\}$ is denoted by

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} a' \underline{a} \\ b' \underline{b} \\ c' \underline{c} \end{array} \right] [\sigma],$$

and so on. The set $\{(x_i, y_i, z_i), s] \in X : s = \sigma\}$ is denoted by $\square[\sigma]$. The notation for particular elements from the above sets is analogous, but the elements of $(\prod_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathcal{A})^3$ are written in curly, instead of square, brackets.

To finish the description of a dynamical hardware we need to specify a division of X . We start with the division

$$X = \bigsqcup_{a,b,c \in \mathcal{A}, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \left[\begin{array}{c} \underline{a} \\ \underline{b} \\ \underline{c} \end{array} \right] [\sigma].$$

and replace each $\begin{bmatrix} \underline{a} \\ \underline{b} \\ \underline{c} \end{bmatrix}$ [INITIAL] by two sets:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{DELIMITER } \underline{a} \\ \text{DELIMITER } \underline{b} \\ \text{DELIMITER } \underline{c} \end{bmatrix} \text{ [INITIAL]}$$

and its complement.

It is a standard calculation using the Pontryagin duality to check that the characteristic functions of the sets above are all elements of $\mathbb{Q}[\widehat{X}]$.

Now we define the dynamical software. The Initial set I is the union of

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{DELIMITER } \underline{a} \\ \text{DELIMITER } \underline{b} \\ \text{DELIMITER } \underline{c} \end{bmatrix} \text{ [INITIAL]}$$

over all $a, b, c \in A(M)$, the Accepting set is defined to be $A = \llbracket \text{ACCEPT} \rrbracket$ and the Rejecting set is the union of $\llbracket \text{REJECT} \rrbracket$ and all the sets $\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$, where $\sigma \in \mathcal{S} - S(M)$.

The assignment of elements of Γ is as follows. On a set $\begin{bmatrix} \text{DELIMITER } \underline{a} \\ \text{DELIMITER } \underline{b} \\ \text{DELIMITER } \underline{c} \end{bmatrix} [\sigma]$, $a, b, c \in \mathcal{A}$, $\sigma \in S(M)$ we act with $\gamma(\sigma, \tau)$, where τ is such that the transition table of M requires changing the state to τ when being in the state σ and encountering the symbols a, b, c on respectively the first, second and third tape. Everywhere else (i.e. for $\sigma \in \mathcal{S} - S(M)$) we act with the identity element of Γ .

The system just defined stops on any configuration because M is foolproof. It does not restart because of the assumption about M that it is impossible to enter the state INITIAL and that the state INITIAL is left immediately.

Finally it has disjoint accepting chains because of the following observation. Let x be an element of the first fundamental set. In particular on all three tapes it is of the form $(\text{DELIMITER } \underline{a})$. Since with probability 1 there is another DELIMITER sign on each tape, we can as well assume that x is of the form $(\text{DELIMITER } \underline{a} \dots \text{DELIMITER})$, with no delimiter symbol in "...". The subsequent iterations of T_X evaluated on x "move the underlining" on the tapes, but they cannot move it beyond the delimiter symbols. Thus whatever is the image of x in the accepting set, we can recover from this image the original configuration x . This means, that the accepting chains are disjoint.

Define $H(M) := \mathbf{Z}_2^m \rtimes GL(\mathbf{Z}_2^m)$, where the semi-direct product is with respect to the Pontryagin-dual action. The previous theorem gives us an operator $S(M) \in \mathbb{Q}[(\mathbf{Z}_2^n \wr \mathbf{Z})^3 \times H(M)]$ such that $\dim_{\mathbf{N}} \ker S(M) = \mu(I) - \Omega_1(T_X)$. However the right-hand side is precisely the measure of those points in

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{DELIMITER } \underline{a} \\ \text{DELIMITER } \underline{b} \\ \text{DELIMITER } \underline{c} \end{bmatrix} \text{ [INITIAL]}$$

which are mapped by some iteration of T_X to $\llbracket \text{REJECT} \rrbracket$. Given a word which $\mathcal{F}(M)$ rejects, we can produce a set of positive measure of such x 's. Conversely, a set of positive measure of such x 's must contain a configuration which contains

DELIMITER symbols both to the left and to the right of the underlining symbols, and so we can produce from it an input which is rejected by $\mathcal{F}(M)$.

Finally we note that $\mathbf{Z}_2^n \wr \mathbf{Z}$ is isomorphic (in an algorithmic fashion with respect to n) to a subgroup of $\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z}$. $\square$

6. THE END GAME

6.1. Lemma. *There exists an algorithm which given n produces an embedding i_n of the matrix algebra $M_n(\mathbb{Q})$ into the group ring $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z}]$ of the lamplighter group such that $\frac{1}{2^{n+2}} \text{tr}_{vN} \circ i_n = \text{tr}$.*

Proof. Let $\chi_j \in \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z}]$ be the Fourier transform of the characteristic function of $[0 \ 1^{j-1} \ \underline{1} \ 1^{n-j} \ 0]$. Define $E_{ij} := t^{i-j} \chi_j \in \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z}]$. It is enough to check that $E_{kl} \cdot E_{ij} = \delta_i^l \cdot E_{kj}$. Note

$$E_{kl} \cdot E_{ij} = t^{k-l} \chi_l \cdot t^{i-j} \chi_j = t^{k-l} \chi_l \cdot \chi_i t^{i-j},$$

which is non-zero iff $i = l$; in this case it is equal to

$$t^{k-i} \chi_i t^{i-j} = t^{k-i} t^{i-j} \chi_j = t^{k-j} \chi_j,$$

as claimed. The statement about the traces follows by noting that the measure of the set $[0 \ 1^{j-1} \ \underline{1} \ 1^{n-j} \ 0]$ is equal to $\frac{1}{2^{n+2}}$. $\square$

6.2. Theorem. *The zero-divisor problem for the group $(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^4$ is not decidable.*

Proof. We show that if this was not the case then we could produce an algorithm which given a Turing machine M decides whether there exists an input which M accepts. The latter problem is well-known to be undecidable (see [Sip97].)

Starting with M , we can algorithmically produce the read-only foolproof machine $\mathcal{F}(M)$ on three tapes from Proposition 4.1 with the property that there exists a word which M accepts iff there exists a word which $\mathcal{F}(M)$ rejects.

Now, thanks to Proposition 5.2 we can algorithmically produce a finite group $H(\mathcal{F}(M))$ and

$$T(\mathcal{F}(M)) \in \mathbb{Z}[(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^3 \times H(\mathcal{F}(M))]$$

such that $\dim_{vN} \ker T(\mathcal{F}(M)) \neq 0$ iff there exists a word which $\mathcal{F}(M)$ rejects.

But note that $\mathbb{Z}[(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^3 \times H(\mathcal{F}(M))]$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}[(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^3] \otimes \mathbb{Z}[H(\mathcal{F}(M))]$. Furthermore, the von Neumann trace corresponds to the product of von Neumann traces. However, $\mathbb{Z}[H(\mathcal{F}(M))]$ can be algorithmically embedded into $M_k(\mathbb{Q})$ in a von Neumann trace-preserving fashion, by using the left regular representation; so by the previous lemma $\mathbb{Z}[H(\mathcal{F}(M))]$ can be algorithmically embedded in $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z}]$ in a way which scales the von Neumann trace.

Therefore, we get the induced embedding of

$$\mathbb{Z}[(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^3 \times H(\mathcal{F}(M))] \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Q}[(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^4]$$

which scales the von Neumann trace; the latter implies that if we denote the image of $T(\mathcal{F}(M))$ by $T(M)$ then $\dim_{vN} \ker T(\mathcal{F}(M)) \neq 0$ iff $\dim_{vN} \ker T(M) \neq 0$ (compare Section 6 in [Gra10b] for more details on the last two paragraphs.).

Thus far we have algorithmically produced an element $T(M) \in \mathbb{Q}[(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^4]$ such that there exists a word which M accepts if $\dim_{vN} \ker T(M) \neq 0$. By clearing the denominators we can just as well assume $T(M) \in \mathbb{Z}[(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^4]$. Now, since

$(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^4$ is an amenable group, $\dim_{\mathbf{v}_N} \ker T(M) \neq 0$ is equivalent to $T(M)$ being a zero-divisor in $\mathbb{Z}[(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^4]$, so if the zero-divisor problem for $(\mathbf{Z}_2 \wr \mathbf{Z})^4$ was decidable we could use it to decide if there is a word accepted by M .

□

REFERENCES

- [Aus09] Tim Austin. Rational group ring elements with kernels having irrational dimension, 2009. Preprint, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0909.2360>.
- [DS02] Warren Dicks and Thomas Schick. The spectral measure of certain elements of the complex group ring of a wreath product. *Geom. Dedicata*, 93:121–137, 2002.
- [Eck00] Beno Eckmann. Introduction to l_2 -methods in topology: reduced l_2 -homology, harmonic chains, l_2 -Betti numbers. *Israel J. Math.*, 117:183–219, 2000. Notes prepared by Guido Mislin.
- [Ele06] Gábor Elek. The strong approximation conjecture holds for amenable groups. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 239(1):345–355, 2006.
- [ES05] Gábor Elek and Endre Szabó. Hyperlinearity, essentially free actions and L^2 -invariants. The sofic property. *Math. Ann.*, 332(2):421–441, 2005.
- [GLSŽ00] Rostislav I. Grigorchuk, Peter Linnell, Thomas Schick, and Andrzej Żuk. On a question of Atiyah. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 331(9):663–668, 2000.
- [Gra10a] Łukasz Grabowski. On the Atiyah problem for the lamplighter groups. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2010. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1009.0229>.
- [Gra10b] Łukasz Grabowski. On Turing dynamical systems and the Atiyah problem. *ArXiv e-prints*, April 2010.
- [Gro99] M. Gromov. Endomorphisms of symbolic algebraic varieties. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 1(2):109–197, 1999.
- [GŻ01] Rostislav I. Grigorchuk and Andrzej Żuk. The lamplighter group as a group generated by a 2-state automaton, and its spectrum. *Geom. Dedicata*, 87(1-3):209–244, 2001.
- [HLP52] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya. *Inequalities*. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1952. 2d ed.
- [Lin93] Peter A. Linnell. Division rings and group von Neumann algebras. *Forum Math.*, 5(6):561–576, 1993.
- [LOS10] P. Linnell, B. Okun, and T. Schick. The strong Atiyah conjecture for right-angled Artin and Coxeter groups. *ArXiv e-prints*, October 2010.
- [LS01] Roger C. Lyndon and Paul E. Schupp. *Combinatorial group theory*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1977 edition.
- [LS07] Peter Linnell and Thomas Schick. Finite group extensions and the Atiyah conjecture. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 20(4):1003–1051 (electronic), 2007.
- [Lüc94] W. Lück. Approximating L^2 -invariants by their finite-dimensional analogues. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 4(4):455–481, 1994.
- [Lüc02] Wolfgang Lück. L^2 -invariants: theory and applications to geometry and K -theory, volume 44 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002.
- [LW10] Franz Lehner and Stephan Wagner. Free Lamplighter Groups and a Question of Atiyah. *ArXiv e-prints*, May 2010. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1005.2347>.
- [Pap08] Daniel Pape. A short proof of the approximation conjecture for amenable groups. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 255(5):1102–1106, 2008.
- [Pes08] Vladimir G. Pestov. Hyperlinear and sofic groups: a brief guide. *Bull. Symbolic Logic*, 14(4):449–480, 2008.
- [PS Z10] Mikaël Pichot, Thomas Schick, and Andrzej Żuk. Closed manifolds with transcendental L^2 -Betti numbers. *ArXiv e-prints*, May 2010. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1005.1147>.

- [RS80] Michael Reed and Barry Simon. *Methods of modern mathematical physics. I*. Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], New York, second edition, 1980. Functional analysis.
- [Sip97] Michael Sipser. *Introduction to the Theory of computation*. PWS Publishing, 1997.
- [Tho08] Andreas Thom. Sofic groups and Diophantine approximation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 61(8):1155–1171, 2008.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON, HUXLEY BUILDING, 180
QUEEN'S GATE, LONDON SW7 2AZ, UK
E-mail address: graboluk@gmail.com